

**Greater Los Angeles Integrated Regional Water Management Plan  
Leadership Committee  
March 1, 2007  
9:30 am – noon  
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works  
900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra**

**Meeting Notes**

**Present:**

Mario Acevedo	Tom Erb	Joone Lopez	Mark Stuart
Desi Alvarez	Belinda Faustinos	Ed Means	Dan Sulzer
Joe Bellomo	Al Gribnau	Rich Nagel	Scott Valor
Hector Bordas	David Hill	Rochelle Paras	Tom West
Barbara Cameron	Mark Horne	Mark Pestrella (via phone)	Robb Whitaker
Donna Chen	Shahram Kharaghani	Leighanne Reeser	Carol Williams
Kathy Delegal	Frank Kuo	Randy Schoellerman	Mary Zauner
Michael Drennan	Kerjon Lee	Nancy Steele	

Agenda Item	Topic/ Issue	Discussion	Action/Follow up
1	Welcome, Introductions	Hector opened the meeting and asked if anyone would like to run the meeting because Diego is out of town, and Mark Pestrella will be calling in by phone. The group nominated Hector. Hector requested self-introductions.	
2	Proposition 84	<p>a. <u>Meeting with Watershed Coalition of Ventura County</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposition 84 identified distinct funding areas, and the Ventura County IRWMP and LA Region IRWMP are included in one funding area. In recognition of this fact, a meeting was set up to discuss the opportunities and constraints of this defined funding area on the future implementation of IRWMP's in both regions.</li> <li>▪ Hector acknowledged that the notice of this meeting to the members of the Leadership Committee could have been improved, and committed to providing better notice in the future.</li> <li>▪ There is a significant amount of funding in Prop 84 outside of the IRWMP funding. It was requested that a Subcommittee be created to evaluate these additional funds to assure that the LA Region receives its fair share. It was recommended that the existing Legislative Subcommittee be utilized for this role. This Subcommittee is already providing comments to influence the implementing legislation for Prop 84. This existing Subcommittee could take on this analysis.</li> <li>▪ Sharon Green, Tom Erb, Kathi Delegal, Mark Pestrella, Frank Kuo, and Hector Bordas from the LA IRWMP met with Dee Zinke and Sue Hughes of the Ventura IRWMP and Michael Hurley of the Upper Santa Clara IRWMP on Feb 28. There was agreement that additional meetings are</li> </ul>	<p>The Legislative Subcommittee agreed to set up a meeting to discuss and evaluate the full funding opportunities available in Prop 84 for the LA Region.</p> <p>A motion was made by Rich Nagel, seconded by Randall Orton, and amended by Belinda Faustinos to:</p> <p>1) Direct the County to work with the Consultant team to develop two potential draft approaches for funding distribution:</p>

*The Mission of the Greater Los Angeles IRWMP is to address the water resources needs of the Region in an integrated and collaborative manner.*

		<p>needed to assure coordination and collaboration. There was agreement that separate IRWMP's are needed for Ventura, LA, and possibly Santa Clara River watershed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hector provided an overview of the meeting with Ventura and indicated that he provided an overview of the LA IRWMP, and Ventura provided an overview of their IRWMP, including history, current status, decision-making structure, etc. There was no discussion of the possible distribution of Prop 84 funds for this funding area. Mark Pestrella emphasized that the LA County representatives went to the meeting to listen and to serve as a delegation from the LA IRWMP. The intention of these meetings is to attempt to reach agreement on the appropriate funding distribution between LA and Ventura. Ventura has acknowledged that many factors such as population, needs, geography, imply that a significant portion of the funding from Prop 84 should probably go to the LA Region. Both LA and Ventura recognize it is probably in each of their interests to self-determine the distribution of funding, and both expressed interest in reaching agreement and providing a recommendation to the State.</li> <li>▪ Mark Stuart commented that the State recognizes that competition yields better projects, but that a set amount of funding is allocated to each statewide funding area.</li> <li>▪ There are a finite number of possible factors to help define an appropriate distribution of funds such as population, water supply issues, 303d listed water bodies, impervious areas, disadvantaged communities, etc. A matrix could be developed to include all appropriate factors to determine appropriate distribution of funds.</li> <li>▪ Prop 84 funding areas were based on population, so it is unclear why it would be appropriate to evaluate other factors.</li> <li>▪ Mark Stuart emphasized that the State is not considering population as the only factor in determining the distribution of funding.</li> <li>▪ It was requested that the matrix be completed by March 8, in preparation for a DWR meeting on funding areas scheduled for March 12. However it was acknowledged that it would not be possible to receive input from each of the Steering Committees before March 12. There was agreement that the matrix column headings could be developed, but the matrix values would not be completed by that date.</li> <li>▪ It was requested that a pre-meeting or conference call be considered on March 9 to prepare for the meeting on March 12.</li> <li>▪ The meeting on March 12 will be held at Metropolitan Water District in Room 8-199 at 10:00 am.</li> </ul> <p>b. <u>DWR Meeting with "Funding Areas"</u></p> <p>No discussion occurred on this agenda item.</p>	<p>a. Population based; b. Matrix based.</p> <p>2) The draft approaches should be presented to the Subregional Steering and Leadership Committees for their review and comment. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Next meeting with Ventura County is scheduled for March 12 at 10:00</p>
3	Status of \$25M Contract with DWR	<p>The state has not provided the official authorization to release the \$25M Prop 50, Round 1 grant yet. Upon formal notice of the grant, the County will set up a meeting of the project sponsors to discuss contract procedures.</p> <p>The state has requested they have a site visit of 8 of the 13 project sites, on April 12, 13, and 14. An email has been distributed to the Leadership Committee which identifies the 8 projects. It was</p>	<p>The County will provide a template for use by each of the project sponsors. Project sponsors can provide the information to the County, and they will put the</p>

		recommended that a standard template for the project fact sheet should be developed.	information into the template.
4	Website Update Presentation	<p>The IRWMP project database website is live.</p> <p>The LA IRWMP webpage is being worked on with respect to updating and posting of minutes and meeting notices (lawaterplan.org). New additions to the webpage database include: project readiness, project proponent's possible partnership fields, ability to eliminate a project, location digitization with multi mapping/sorting capabilities, database ownership belonging to proponents (responsible for validity of information).</p> <p>New project submittals through the website will be refreshed on the database monthly. Some projects have been identified as not in the database and may need to be re-entered by proponents.</p>	An email will be sent to all project proponents asking for project information updates (specifically highlighting Lat/Long Coordinates and subregion). The projects need to be updated by end of April.
5	Update Consultant Scope of Work	<p><u>a. Decision-making structure.</u> A memo was distributed which provided a summary of the decision-making structure of six other IRWMP groups. The consultant team is conducting interviews and discussions with each of the Steering Committees to collect input on what's working and not working with the current decision-making structure, and will provide a facilitated discussion at the next Leadership Committee meeting. It was requested that contact information of each of the six groups be provided in the memo. It was also requested that the recommendations of the LASG Watershed Council be acknowledged in the memo.</p> <p><u>b. Comments to DWR on the IRWM Program.</u> A draft memo will be developed by next Monday, March 5 for review, and comments are needed by Wednesday, March 7.</p> <p><u>c. Highlights Document.</u> A handout was provided which outlines preliminary conclusions regarding the audience, message, content, next steps, format, and process for development of the document. It was requested that some conclusions such as number of projects, lessons learned, accomplishments, list of future needs.</p> <p><u>d. Project Identification and Prioritization.</u> Draft framework is being developed and provided to Steering Committees for their review and comment. It is likely that projects that do not have quantified benefits will not be prioritized for the next round of grant funding. Projects in the IRWMP database need to be updated by April 30 to be included in the prioritization process. Projects will be prioritized in May and June at the Steering Committees. The consultant team will provide a list of projects for each subregion, and identify which projects have quantified benefits and which do not. The Steering Committees will be expected to sort the projects with have quantified benefits and determine the top 30 projects. These 30 projects should be selected based on the philosophy that they are the best projects from the subregion, not necessarily the best projects for a particular grant funding source. The top 10 projects from this list will be</p> <p>March Steering Committee Meeting agenda items – Decision Making Structure will be discussed; draft prioritization framework will be provided by March 14.</p>	<p>A draft memo will be developed by the consultant team providing comments to DWR on the IRWM Program by next Monday, March 5 for review, and comments are needed by Wednesday, March 7.</p> <p>A draft prioritization framework will be prepared by the consultant team and provided to the Chairs of the Steering Committees by March 14.</p> <p>Chairs of the Steering Committees should provide a notice to their stakeholders to encourage them to update their projects to include quantified benefits, or add new projects, prior to April 30.</p>
6	<u>Consultant Contract Expiration (6/30/07), Proceed with a New RFP and</u>	This item should be discussed at the next Leadership Committee meeting.	

	<u>Scope?</u>		
7	IRWMP Video	Hector indicated that Brown and Caldwell is offering to provide a 90-second video which provides an overview of the IRWMP at no cost to the Leadership Committee. The video would be produced as part of Brown and Caldwell's newsletter, BC Water News, but would also serve as a tool for the Leadership Committee to deliver their message to others. The video should include a pan of the room showing the number of participants at Leadership Committee meetings.	Tom Erb motioned, and Rich Nagel seconded, to direct the County to work with Brown and Caldwell to produce a draft video for review by the Leadership Committee. The motion passed unanimously.
8	Future Agenda Items/Other Items	<p>Belinda indicated that some members of the Lower SGLA subregion expressed concern that the MOU provides only for activities relevant to Proposition 50, and yet many activities are currently being considered for Proposition 84.</p> <p>The State Board is going to make a decision on March 20 regarding allocation of funds to Areas of Special Biological Significance. Barbara requested that the Leadership Committee consider providing a letter expressing support for Prop 50 funds to projects in ASBS's watershed tributary to the ASBS in Malibu. Barbara offered to draft a letter for Don Wolfe's signature.</p>	Desi motioned and Rich Nagel seconded, that the Chair of Leadership Committee to prepare and send a letter to the State Board expressing support for use of Prop 50 funds for any IRWMP that includes an Areas of Special Biological Significance regardless of whether it is a coastal IRWMP. The motion passed unanimously.
9	Next Meeting	<p>April 5, 2007            9:30 am to 12:00 pm            Executive Conference Room, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor            Los Angeles County Flood Control District</p>	